Applicant: JOHNSON *et al.*Serial No: 09/667,693

Filing Date: September 22, 2000

Page: 6 of 8

## **REMARKS**

Response, dated: April 10, 2013

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed **December 10, 2012** (hereinafter "Office Action"), no claims have been amended, cancelled, or newly added. However, because this is a <u>REISSUE</u> application, pursuant to **MPEP § 1453(IV)**, the claims have been presented relative to the patent specification in effect as of the date of the filing of the Reissue application, and not relative to the prior amendment. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 remain pending. In view of the following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

## 37 C.F.R. § 1.173(c) STATEMENT

## A. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 are pending in the application.

Claims 3, 8, and 10-20 are cancelled.

More particularly:

- claims 1, 2, 7, and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,249 have each been (previously)
  twice amended;
- claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,249 has been (previously) amended one time;
- claims 3 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,249 were previously cancelled; and
- claims 10-20, which were newly added in the Preliminary Amendment filed on September 22, 2000, were previously cancelled.

# B. DESCRIPTION OF (AND SUPPORT FOR) CLAIM CHANGES

By this Amendment, **no** claims have been amended, cancelled, or newly added.

### REISSUE of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,249

Applicant: JOHNSON *et al.*Serial No: 09/667,693

Filing Date: September 22, 2000

Page: 7 of 8

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 251**

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 251 as allegedly being based upon a defective reissue oath/declaration.

Response, dated: April 10, 2013

A. The Examiner first alleges that "...the declaration filed 10/16/2012 does not specifically list all amendments filed subsequent the original oath" [Office Action, pg. 2]. The Examiner then erroneously alleges that:

[T]he dates of every amendment filed subsequent to the original oath/declaration comprise: 1/22/2008; 5/5/2009; 11/16/2010; 6/24/2011; 1/13/2012; 2/22/2012; and 10/16/2012.

[Office Action, pg. 2].

The foregoing statement is not accurate.

The <u>CLAIMS</u> have <u>ONLY</u> been amended in the instant REISSUE application in the following <u>four</u> amendments:

- (1) September 22, 2000;
- (2) January 22, 2008;
- (3) May 5, 2009; and
- (4) November 16, 2010.

These four dates were identified in the 10/16/12 Declaration.

No claims were amended in the Responses filed on June 24, 2011, January 13, 2012, February 22, 2012, or October 16, 2012. Further, no claims have been amended by this Response. However, the claims have always been presented in these Responses with the amendments depicted, because this is a REISSUE application. Pursuant to MPEP § 1453(IV), the claims must always be presented relative to the patent specification in effect as of the date of the filing of the Reissue application, and not relative to the prior amendment.

REISSUE of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,249

Applicant: JOHNSON et al.

Serial No: 09/667,693

Filing Date: September 22, 2000

Page: 8 of 8

For at least the foregoing reasons, this portion of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 251

Response, dated: April 10, 2013

is improper and should be withdrawn.

B. The Examiner further alleges that the "error statement is not specific

enough" and suggests that the language of the prior declaration further include the

additional recitation of "...was not needed for patentability" [Office Action, pg. 3].

Although there is no legal basis for this requirement, a Supplemental Reissue

Declaration is being provided herewith solely in an effort to expedite prosecution.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 under

35 U.S.C. § 251 is earnestly sought.

**CONCLUSION** 

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a

full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such,

the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the

number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2013

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By:

/Bradford C. Blaise/

Bradford C. Blaise

Registration No. 47,429

Customer No. 00909

P.O. Box 10500

McLean, Virginia 22102

Direct Dial: 703.770.7741

Main: 703.770.7900

Fax: 703.770.7901

403936551 1.DOC